

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
WESTERN DISTRICT OF MICHIGAN  
SOUTHERN DIVISION

GEORGE HALL, # 090753,	)	
Plaintiff,	)	
	)	No. 1:10-cv-1221
-v-	)	
	)	HONORABLE PAUL L. MALONEY
MIKE MARTIN, et al.,	)	
Defendants.	)	
_____	)	

**ORDER ADOPTING REPORT AND RECOMMENDATION AND DENYING  
PLAINTIFF’S MOTION FOR SUMMARY JUDGMENT**

Plaintiff George Hall, a prisoner under the control of the Michigan Department of Corrections, alleges claims against the two remaining defendants relating to the meal plans offered at his place of confinement. Hall filed a motion for summary judgment. (ECF No. 58.) The magistrate judge issued a report (ECF No. 65) recommending Hall’s claims for injunctive relief be dismissed as moot and also recommending that Hall’s motion for summary judgment be denied. Hall filed objections. (ECF No. 66.)

After being served with a report and recommendation (R&R) issued by a magistrate judge, a party has fourteen days to file written objections to the proposed findings and recommendations. 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1); Fed. R. Civ. P. 72(b). A district court judge reviews de novo the portions of the R&R to which objections have been filed. 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1); Fed. R. Civ. P. 72(b). Only those objections that are specific are entitled to a de novo review under the statute. *Mira v. Marshall*, 806 F.2d 636, 637 (6th Cir. 1986) (per curiam) (holding the district court need not provide de novo review where the objections are frivolous, conclusive or too general because the burden is on the parties to “pinpoint those portions of the magistrate’s report that the district court must specifically consider”).

Hall objects to the recommendation that his claims for injunctive relief be dismissed as moot. The magistrate judge correctly concluded that the evidence in the record establishes that the new meal plan was implemented in December 2013 and that it meets Hall's religious dietary needs. Hall does not challenge this factual conclusion. Hall's objection, that the passover meals will contain meat and animal products, is not supported by any evidence in the record. Therefore, the objection is overruled.

Hall also objects to the recommendation that his motion for summary judgment be denied. The magistrate judge concluded only that Hall's evidence was not so strong that no reasonable trier of fact would be free to disbelieve it. Because there remained disputed material facts, such that a reasonable trier of fact could find that Hall suffered damages less than he seeks or even no damages at all, the magistrate judge recommended the motion be denied. Hall objects only to the recommendation that a reasonable trier of fact could find that he suffered no damages. The Court finds no factual or legal error in the R&R. Therefore, the objection is overruled.

Having reviewed the R&R and objections, the Court **ADOPTS** the R&R (ECF No. 65) as its opinion over Hall's objections. Hall's request for injunctive relief is **DISMISSED AS MOOT**. Hall's motion for summary judgment (ECF No. 58) is **DENIED. IT IS SO ORDERED.**

Date: April 10, 2014

/s/ Paul L. Maloney  
Paul L. Maloney  
Chief United States District Judge